

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

BAD RIVER BAND OF THE LAKE
SUPERIOR TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA
INDIANS OF THE BAD RIVER
RESERVATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

ENBRIDGE ENERGY COMPANY, INC.,
and ENBRIDGE ENERGY, L.P.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-00602-wmc

Judge William M. Conley
Magistrate Judge Stephen L. Crocker

ENBRIDGE ENERGY COMPANY, INC.,
and ENBRIDGE ENERGY, L.P.,

Counter-Plaintiffs,

v.

BAD RIVER BAND OF THE LAKE
SUPERIOR TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA
INDIANS OF THE BAD RIVER
RESERVATION and NAOMI TILLISON,
in her official capacity,

Counter-Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF BAD RIVER BAND OF THE LAKE SUPERIOR TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA
INDIANS' PROPOSED FORM OF SPECIAL VERDICT**

Pursuant to the Court's Opinion and Order of September 16, 2022, at 4 (Dkt. 369), Plaintiff Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians of the Bad River Reservation ("Band") respectfully requests that the Court use the following proposed special verdict form.

SPECIAL VERDICT

SPECIAL VERDICT PART I: MEASURE OF PROFITS-BASED RELIEF FOR PAST UNJUST ENRICHMENT AND CONSCIOUS TRESPASS

1. What is the proper amount of profits-based relief for Enbridge's unjust enrichment and conscious trespass to date?

\$ _____

SPECIAL VERDICT PART II: MEASURE OF PROFITS-BASED RELIEF FOR ANY FUTURE PIPELINE OPERATION

1. What is the proper amount of profits-based relief for any future period of time during which Enbridge continues to operate Line 5 on the Reservation?

\$ _____

SPECIAL VERDICT PART III: PUBLIC NUISANCE LIABILITY

1. Would a rupture of Line 5 in the vicinity of the Bad River Meander constitute an unreasonable interference with the public rights, health, safety or welfare of the Band?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. Given the probability and magnitude of the potential harm, is the risk of a rupture of Line 5 at the Bad River Meander more than a reasonable person would incur, such that equitable relief is necessary?

_____ Yes _____ No

3. Is Enbridge's continued operation of the pipeline at the Bad River Meander the cause of any "unreasonable interference with the public rights, health, safety or welfare of the Band" arising out of the operation of the pipeline at that location?

_____ Yes _____ No

4. Would Enbridge's proposed remediation projects at the Meander require entry upon and alteration to Reservation lands and waters with respect to which it has no valid easement or other property rights?

_____ Yes _____ No

5. Can Enbridge defeat nuisance liability by proposing to engage in remediation projects at the Meander that would require entry upon and alteration to Reservation lands and waters with respect to which it has no valid easement or other property rights?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. Has Enbridge obtained for its proposed remediation projects at the Meander all water quality certifications, permits, and other environmental approvals from the Band, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other entities as required under federal and Band law?

_____ Yes _____ No

7. Can Enbridge defeat nuisance liability by proposing to engage in remediation projects for which it has not obtained water quality certifications, permits, and other environmental approvals from the Band, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and other entities as required under federal and Band law?

_____ Yes _____ No

8. Do Enbridge's proposed remediation projects at the Meander pose a threat of adverse environmental consequences to Reservation resources?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. Do Enbridge's proposed remediation projects at the Meander have a non-trivial risk of project failure?

_____ Yes _____ No

10. Can Enbridge defeat nuisance liability by proposing to engage in remediation projects that pose a threat of adverse environmental consequences to Reservation resources and/or that have a non-trivial risk of project failure?

_____ Yes _____ No

SPECIAL VERDICT PART IV: ENTITLEMENT TO INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE

1. Is an injunction necessary to prevent irreparable harm to the Band?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. Are the remedies available at law adequate to compensate for such harm?

_____ Yes _____ No

3. Does the balance of hardships from granting or denying injunctive relief weigh in favor of the Band?

_____ Yes _____ No

4. Would an injunction serve the public interest?

_____ Yes _____ No

5. Do the above four factors weigh in favor of an injunction?

_____ Yes _____ No

SPECIAL VERDICT PART V: FORM OF INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1. Is Enbridge entitled to an injunction allowing continued operation of Line 5 on the Reservation for an indefinite period of time absent compliance with the tribal and federal consent requirements set forth in the Non-Intercourse Act, 25 U.S.C. § 177, the 1948 Right of Way Act, 25 U.S.C. §§ 323–28, and the 1854 Treaty with the Chippewa, 10 Stat. 1109?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. Given the probability and magnitude of the potential harm from a rupture of Line 5 on the Reservation, would the public interest be served by an injunction that allows for the continued operation of Line 5 on the Reservation indefinitely?

_____ Yes _____ No

3. Should the Court issue an injunction allowing for continued operation of Line 5 on the Reservation for a longer time period than what is necessary to allow Enbridge and other market actors to develop alternatives to Line 5 sufficient to protect the public interest?

_____ Yes _____ No

4. Does the public interest require permitting Enbridge to remain on the Reservation for an indefinite period of five years or more?

_____ Yes _____ No

5. For what time period does the public interest require permitting Enbridge to continue to operate Line 5 on the Reservation?

Dated: September 21, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Erick Arnold
BAD RIVER BAND OF THE LAKE SUPERIOR
TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF THE BAD
RIVER RESERVATION
72682 Maple Street
Odanah, Wisconsin 54861
attorney@badriver-nsn.gov
(715) 682-7107

Bruce Wallace
HOOPER HATHAWAY PRICE BEUCHE
& WALLACE
126 S. Main Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
bwallace@hooperhathaway.com
(734) 662-4426

Oday Salim
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
213 West Liberty Street, Suite 200
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
salimo@nwf.org
Ph: (586) 255-8857

/s/ Riyaz A. Kanji
Riyaz A. Kanji
David A. Giampetroni
Lucy W. Braun
KANJI & KATZEN, P.L.L.C.
303 Detroit Street, Suite 400
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
rkanji@kanjikatzen.com
dgiampetroni@kanjikatzen.com
lbraun@kanjikatzen.com
Ph: (734) 769-5400

Jane G. Steadman
Philip H. Tinker
Claire R. Newman
KANJI & KATZEN, P.L.L.C.
811 1st Avenue, Suite 630
Seattle, WA 98104
jsteadman@kanjikatzen.com
ptinker@kanjikatzen.com
cnewman@kanjikatzen.com
Ph: (206) 344-8100

*Counsel for the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior
Tribe of Chippewa Indians and Naomi Tillison, Director
of the Mashkiiziibii Natural Resources Department of
the Bad River Band, in her official capacity*